In the specification:

Change the paragraph beginning at page 9, line 23, to read
as follows:

--Referring now to ~~Figs. 1A~~Fig. 1A, the different data items
used as part of the invention are shown as including two data
stores: a knowledge base 11 of generic risk records (risk records
not associated with any particular profile or context) organized
by category, and a contexts data store 12, each context serving
as a folder (sub-data-store) of a set of logically related
profiles, each profile in turn serving as a folder of a set of
(non-generic) risk records. Fig. 1A shows that a risk record
(actually a collection of table entries in the preferred
embodiment of a relational database implementation, as described
below in connection with Fig. 1D), includes four main components:
a risk component, a cause component, one or more consequence
components, and one or more control components, each of which is
either a preventive control or a corrective control.--

Change the paragraph beginning at page 10, line 7, to read
as follows:

--Referring now to Fig. 1B, the knowledge base 11 and the
context data store 12 are shown in a tree structure
representation. A plus sign placed to the left of a block is
used to indicate that the block includes contents that are not
shown in the view, i.e. in the terminology used in a graphical
user interface tree structure representation of the content of a
disk drive, such as provided by the WINDOWS EXPLORER~~Windows
Explorer~~ file manager application available as part of the
WINDOWS~~Windows~~ operating systems provided by Microsoft
Corporation, the block is not fully *expanded*. A minus sign to
the left of a block indicates that a block is fully expanded,

-2-

i.e. that its full content to the next level in the tree structure is shown. Thus, referring in particular to Fig. 1B, a context folder is shown containing two profiles, one of which is expanded to show that it contains two risks. One of the risks is in turn expanded to show that it contains two preventive controls, two consequences, and one cause. Finally, one of the consequences is expanded to show that it contains two corrective controls.--

Change the paragraph beginning at page 25, line 3, to read as follows:

--In creating the action plan, the user will typically configure a view of some or all the controls of a profile. In the preferred embodiment of the invention, as indicated in Fig. 4, with a list of all the controls of the profile, a user is able to assign a value to fitness for more than one control at a time by highlighting (selecting) each control that is to be assigned the same value for fitness (such as for example the value ~~redundant~~key, which is the value shown selected in Fig. 4) and then clicking on a tab indicating *fitness* so that a drop-down list appears, from which the particular value to be assigned to all of the selected controls is picked and ends up being attached to each selected control.--

Change the paragraph beginning at page 25, line 14, to read as follows:

--Referring now to Fig. 5, a scenario is indicated in which a user updates the quantitative or subjective fields in the risk records of a profile based on values stored in the knowledge base. In this scenario, after updating the fields, the user reviews the values provided by the knowledge base and decides whether to override any of the values. The values provided by

-3-

the knowledge base include values for each of the measuring fields: the inherent likelihood of a risk, the inherent cost of the consequence, and the effectiveness of a control. In a next step according to this scenario, the user reviews all risks ranked in order of residual rating. The user reviews the values for the measuring fields associated with each risk and then, in a next step in which the user adjusts controls so as to fix the maximum and total risk to acceptable values (in terms of residual ratings), the user accepts or overrides the values based on either actual experience of the user in connection with the profile, or based on other information or even simply based on an educated guess. The user then proceeds as in the previous scenario to create an action plan beginning with the step of reviewing all risks ranked in order of residual risk.--

Change the paragraph beginning at page 29, line 1, to read as follows:

--As explained above, in the preferred embodiment, the invention provides a graphical user interface in which information is presented to a user in one or more windows, such as the so called *windows* of the product WINDOWS EXPLORER~~Windows Explorer~~ provided by Microsoft Corporation as part of operating system MICROSOFT WINDOWS~~Microsoft Windows~~. The present invention, however, in the preferred embodiment, extends the use of windows compared to the use made by WINDOWS EXPLORER~~Windows Explorer~~. While WINDOWS EXPLORER ~~Windows Explorer~~ provides lists of data in columns in a window to the right of a selected item in a left hand window, the present invention allows a user to select multiple items in a left hand window and show the corresponding data for all of the selected items in the right hand window. For example, if the user selects several different profiles in a left hand window, the right hand window will show the values of the

fields for each risk record in the selected profile as well as indicating the profile containing the risk records. In addition, the user is then able to interact directly with the values of the fields of the different risk records that are displayed in the right hand window, including editing the values of any such fields. Further, the invention allows a user to have the system display in the right hand window more than one list, each list possibly providing the data in more than one selected item (profile) in the left hand window.--

Change the paragraph beginning at page 29, line 25, to read as follows:

--As mentioned above, the invention offers a mixture of use sophistication, or in other words, different *modes of use* (as opposed to modes of analysis, described above, including for example the controls self-assessment mode of analysis). Referring now to Figs. 9A-9C, three increasingly sophisticated ways of using the invention are illustrated. Referring now in particular to Fig. 9A, the most straightforward use of the invention, i.e. the first stage of sophistication, is shown as a use in which four fields are manually assessed (i.e. values are provided for the fields by the user): the inherent likelihood and the inherent risk impact cost fields (from which the inherent risk rating is calculated by the invention), and the residual likelihood and the residual risk impact cost fields (from which the residual risk rating is calculated by the invention). (An "M" inside a data-item block indicates that the item is manually assessed, i.e. the field corresponding to the data is being treated as a measuring field instead of a calculated field. A "C" inside such a block indicates that the data item is calculated by the invention. The "R" in the diagram indicates risk, the "Q" represents consequence, and ~~the~~ a subscripted "C"

-5-

represents a control, <u>subscripted with a "Q" to indicate</u> either a
preventive control, and so associated directly with the risk, or
<u>subscripted with a "R" to indicate</u> a corrective control, and so
associated directly with the consequence.) In this most
straightforward use of the invention, there is no assessment of
controls, or in other words, the effectiveness of each control is
not entered expressly, but the effect of one or more controls is
implicitly taken into account by the user entering the residual
likelihood and residual consequence. Correspondingly, whether
the user provides consequences at the consequence level is
optional.--

     Change the paragraph beginning at page 31, line 25, to read
as follows:

     --<u>Referring now to Fig.9C, i</u>~~In~~n stage three, the user makes
an assessment (manual input) of the effectiveness of the controls
at both the preventive control level and the corrective control
level, and the invention then calculates at the risk level the
corresponding residual likelihood and residual risk impact cost
(the invention finally calculating the residual risk rating based
on the residual likelihood and residual risk impact cost values).
The calculations for both the residual likelihood and residual
risk impact cost are aggregate calculations, i.e. they account
for the effect of all preventive and corrective controls for the
risk. The invention also then calculates the mean control values
as the difference between the inherent levels and residual levels
at the risk level, i.e. based on the aggregate calculations.
(The mean control values are therefore for information only; they
are not used to determine the residual risk rating.)--